



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

MATTINGLY, STANGER, & MALUR P.C.  
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD  
SUITE 370  
ALEXANDRIA VA 22314

In re Application of: Kaneda et al.  
Application No. 10/720,308  
Filed: November 25, 2003  
For: DATA STORAGE SYSTEM, DATA  
STORAGE APPARATUS, COMPUTERS  
AND PROGRAMS

**MAILED**

MAY 12 2005

*Technology Center 2100*

DECISION ON PETITION  
TO MAKE SPECIAL  
(ACCELERATED  
EXAMINATION)  
UNDER M.P.E.P. §708.02 (VIII)

This is a response to the petition filed February 23, 2005, under 37 C.F.R. §1.102(d) and M.P.E.P. §708.02 (VIII): Accelerated Examination, to make the above-identified application special.

The Petition is **DISMISSED**.

M.P.E.P. §708.02, Section VIII, which sets out the prerequisites for a grantable petition for Accelerated Examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.102(d) states in relevant part:

A new application (one which has not received any examination by the examiner) may be granted special status provided that applicant (and this term includes applicant's attorney or agent) complies with each of the following items:

- (a) Submits a petition to make special accompanied by the fee set forth in **37 CFR 1.17(h)**;
- (b) Presents all claims directed to a single invention, or if the Office determines that all the claims presented are not obviously directed to a single invention, will make an election without traverse as a prerequisite to the grant of special status;

(c) Submits a statement(s) that a pre-examination search was made, listing the field of search by class and subclass, publication, Chemical Abstracts, foreign patents, etc. The pre-examination search must be directed to the invention as claimed in the application for which special status is requested. A search made by a foreign patent office satisfies this requirement;

(d) Submits one copy each of the references deemed most closely related to the subject matter encompassed by the claims if said references are not already of record; and

(e) Submits a detailed discussion of the references, which discussion points out, with the particularity required by 37 CFR 1.111 (b) and (c), how the claimed subject matter is patentable over the references.

In those instances where the request for this special status does not meet all the prerequisites set forth above, petitioner will be notified and the defects in the request will be stated. The application will remain in the status of a new application awaiting action in regular turn. In those instances where a request is defective in one or more respects, petitioner will be given one opportunity to perfect the request in a renewed petition to make special. If perfected, the request will then be granted. If not perfected in the renewed petition, any additional renewed petitions to make special may or may not be considered at the discretion of the Group Special Program Examiner.

The petition filed February 23, 2005 fails to adequately meet requirement (e) of the criteria set forth above. With respect to requirement (e), applicant must provide a detailed discussion of the referenced documents. The Petitioner's detailed discussion does not specify the features of claims 8, 10 and 12 that define over the references cited. Note, the recitation of **the managing unit that specifies a storage volume to be accessed based on an access request from a computer to a virtual drive unit and volume management information** has not been set forth in claims 8, 10 or 12. Furthermore, the features are also not clearly specified in claims 11 and 13; since, claim 11 specifies a "function for specifying..." and claim 13 indicates "specifying said storage volume to be accessed..." instead of the bold features above, which are argued by the Petitioner as features not taught by each of the references. Petitioner should ensure that the above discussion is directed to how the language of **each of the independent claims** is specifically distinguishable and patentable from each reference provided in requirement (d) above. The statement that the references shares the same deficiencies as another reference is not sufficient to meet the requirement of a detailed discussion as required by 37 CFR 1.111 (b) and (c).

The submission does not satisfy the requirement, as it does not provide a **detailed discussion** of the references and it does not point out how the **claimed subject matter is patentable over the references**. Petitioner should ensure that the above discussion is directed to how the language of **each of the independent claims** is

specifically distinguishable and patentable from the references provided in requirement (d) above.

Petition to Make Special **DISMISSED**.

Petitioner is given one opportunity to perfect the petition. Any request for reconsideration must be filed within TWO MONTHS of the mail date of this decision.

Until the renewed petition is submitted, the application will be returned to the examiner's docket to await treatment on the merits in the normal order of examination.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian L. Johnson 5/3/05  
Special Program Examiner  
Technology Center 2100  
Computer Architecture, Software and Information Security  
571-272-3595

JC